# ● PRINTER RUSH ●
## (PTO ASSISTANCE)

ABRAHAM

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application:** 09/775953 | **Examiner:** ~~TAMARRE~~ | **GAU:** 2133 |
| **From:** N1193 | **Location:** (IDC) FMF FDC | **Date:** 7-7-05 |

**Tracking #:** 06108872    **Week Date:** 5-23-05

| DOC CODE | DOC DATE | MISCELLANEOUS |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ 1449 | | ☐ Continuing Data |
| ☐ IDS | | ☐ Foreign Priority |
| ☑ CLM | 3-14-05 | ☐ Document Legibility |
| ☑ IIFW | 4-21-05 | ☐ Fees |
| ☐ SRFW | | ☐ Other |
| ☐ DRW | | |
| ☐ OATH | | |
| ☐ 312 | | |
| ☐ SPEC | | |

**[RUSH] MESSAGE:** RENUMBERED CLAIMS 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 19 HAVE MORE THAN ONE DEPENDENCY; one OF WHICH IS A HIGHER DEPENDENT CLAIM.

Please Resolve.

THANK YOU
N1193

**[XRUSH] RESPONSE:** There is no problem with the claims meaning it is ok to have multiple dependency as long as the claims are claimed in the alternative.

Ex. Claim 2 depend on 1 or 32 is appropriate. Claim 2 depend on 1 and 32 is ~~so~~ inappropriate.

**INITIALS:** SA

NOTE: This form will be included as part of the official USPTO record, with the Response document coded as XRUSH.
REV 10/04